

## REMARKS

By way of the present response, claim 1 has been amended and new claims 9 and 10 have been added. Claims 1-10 currently are pending. In view of the above amendments and the remarks that follow, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the claims.

At the outset, Applicant notes with appreciation the Examiner's indication that claims 3-8 have been allowed.

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to FIGS. 1A to 8B, 11 and 12 for not including a designation such as "Prior Art." In response, Applicant submits herewith 10 replacement drawing sheets in which each of FIGS. 1A to 8B, 11 and 12 have been amended to include the suggested legend "-Prior Art-." It is respectfully submitted that these amendments have rendered moot the objection to the drawings.

In the Office Action, claims 1 and 2 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102, as allegedly being anticipated by admissions of prior art, Figures 8A and 8B. This rejection is respectfully traversed insofar as the Office may consider it to apply to the amended claims.

For instance, it is respectfully submitted that Applicant's related art description of Figures 8A and 8B does not mention or suggest the combination of features now recited in claim 1 that includes, among other things, the processes of forming a first display device pattern and a first wiring pattern over a substrate by exposing the substrate to light through a reticle, and forming a second display device pattern and a second wiring pattern over the substrate by exposing the substrate to light through the same reticle. For example, page 10, line 24 to page 11, line 4 and line 22 to page 11, line 7, and Figures 9 and 10 of Applicant's specification describe forming a first device pattern 103a and a first wiring pattern 901 over a substrate 101 by exposing the substrate 101 to light through a reticle 102, forming a second display device pattern and a second wiring pattern over the substrate by exposing to light through the same reticle 102.

While Figures 8A and 8B of Applicant's description of the prior art shows forming a first display device pattern and a first wiring pattern, and a second display device pattern and a second wiring pattern, these patterns are formed by exposing the substrate to light through *multiple reticles* (see, lines 10-11 of page 7). Consequently, Figures 8A and 8B of Applicant's related art description do not disclose forming a first device pattern and a first

wiring pattern over a substrate by exposing the substrate to light through a reticle, and forming a second display device pattern and a second wiring pattern over the substrate by exposing the substrate to light *through the same reticle* as set forth in amended claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable.

Claim 2 also is considered allowable because it depends from claim 1, and thus encompasses the novel aspects described above. Additionally, claim 2 recites a combination including additional features not described in the section of Applicant's specification describing the related art relied upon in the rejection.

New claim 9 is directed to a manufacturing method of a display device and recites similar distinguishing features not shown in Figures 8A and 8B of Applicant's prior art description. Hence, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of features recited in claim 9, and thus also in dependent claim 10, are allowable.

Based on the foregoing, it is believed the pending rejection has been overcome and that the application is in condition for allowance. Prompt notification of the same is earnestly sought.

Respectfully submitted,



John F. Guay  
Registration No. 47,248

NIXON PEABODY LLP  
Suite 900, 401 9<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20004-2128  
(202) 585-8000